



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/787,096	03/13/2001	Gijsbert Joseph Van Den Enden	PHN 17,551	1082	
24737	7590 12/14/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			AGUSTIN, PET	TER VINCENT	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2652		

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/787,096	VAN DEN ENDEN, GIJSBERT JOSEPH
•	Examiner	Art Unit
	Peter Vincent Agustin	2652
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 18 November 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice the same of this application in the same of t	cation. A proper reply to a chiple ch
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action: or (2) as set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>27 September 2004</u> CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 	g. Appellant's Brief must be filed R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal (d within the period set forth in of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	·
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);	•
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) (1) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: of	r reconsideration has been cons the reasons noted on item 10 belov	sidered but does NOT place the \underline{w} .
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the response after final a)	☐ will not be entered or b)⊠ w	vill be entered.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to: 9-12		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 13-22</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	<u> </u>
10.⊠ Other: <u>The applicant's arguments against the rejection</u>	of claims 1-8 and 13-22 have been	
were not found to be persuasive. Therefore, the rejections are	maintained.	
	WILLIA PRIMAI	M KLIMOWICZ RY EXAMINER